

# **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Part II**

for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on  
**School Year 2002-2003**



**DUE JUNE 30, 2004**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	ii
General Instructions and Timelines	vi
Cover Page for Submission	vii
Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)	1
William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)	5
Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)	10
Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)	21
Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F)	22
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) Title II, Part A)	23
Enhancing Education Through Technology (Title II, Part D)	24
English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement (Title III, Part A)	25
Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (Title IV, Part A)	27
21 <sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)	31
Innovative Programs (Title V, Part A)	32
Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) (Title VI, Part B)	34
Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)	35

# INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce “red tape” and burden on States, the Consolidated Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title IV, Part B – *21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States submitted to the Department on December 22, 2003, requested information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of NCLB. Through the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submissions and through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States have already submitted the following 2002-2003 school year data related to the five ESEA goals.

- **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

In Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States reported the percentage of students proficient or advanced in reading/language arts and mathematics, based on assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year. States reported achievement data for the following subgroups of students: all students, major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, migrant students, and gender.

- **Performance goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided the following: (1) the status of the State's efforts to establish English language proficiency (ELP) standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students; (2) English language proficiency (ELP) data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration; (3) Information on the total number of students assessed for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s); (4) Information on the total number of students identified as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s); and (5) performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and the percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency.

- **Performance goal 3:** By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission and Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States provided the following information from the 2002-2003 school year: (1) the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by "highly qualified" teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high and low-poverty schools in the State; (2) the percentage of teachers who received "high-quality professional development;" and (3) the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

- **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year.

- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, States provided baseline graduation rate and dropout rate data from the 2001-2002 school year for the following subgroups of students: all students, major racial/ethnic groups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, migrant students, and gender.

This Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2002-2003 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department on **June 30, 2004**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

Also, this report is limited to information that States should have available by Spring, 2004.

Consistent with these criteria, Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year does not request additional data for the programs listed below.

- Title I, Part D: Neglected or Delinquent - The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2003-2004 school year. This data will not be available in Spring 2004, but will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report which will cover the results of school year 2003-2004 activities.
- Title I, Part F: Comprehensive School Reform – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.
- Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund (Improving Teacher Quality State Grants) – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented. Additionally, in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application and in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2002-2003 school year, States reported information related to teacher and paraprofessional quality, including the percentage of classes taught by high-qualified teachers, the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development, and the percentage of highly-qualified Title I paraprofessionals.
- Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology – The first school year in which LEA projects were implemented is the 2003-2004 school year. Therefore performance data for this program will not be available until next year when the next Consolidated State Performance Report will be due.

- Title IV, Part B: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers – Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2003-2004 school year and beyond.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2002-2003 school year must respond to this Part II of Consolidated State Performance Report. Reports are due to the Department on **June 30, 2004**, and should reflect data from the 2002-2003 school year. If needed, States should include for each section an explanation of the data provided (e.g., data irregularities). Throughout the report, States should use their definition of a school year, unless noted otherwise.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

To expedite the receipt of this report, please send your report via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file to [conreport@ed.gov](mailto:conreport@ed.gov), or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Please send a follow-up, signed paper copy of "Consolidated State Performance Report Signature Page" via an express courier to the address below.

A State that submits only a paper report should mail the submission by express courier to:

Daisy Greenfield  
U.S. Department of Education  
Room 3E307  
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20202-6400

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 2.32 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write directly to Consolidated State Performance Report, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3E307, Washington, DC 20202-6400.

OMB Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
Expiration Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Consolidated State Performance Report  
For  
State Formula Grant Programs  
under the  
Elementary And Secondary Education Act  
as amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

South Dakota Department of Education

Address:

700 Governors Drive  
Pierre, SD 57501-2291

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Diane R. Lowery

Telephone: 605-773-6509

Fax: 605-773-3782

e-mail: diane.lowery@state.sd.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Dr. Rick Melmer, Department Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



<p style="text-align: center;"><b>I. Improving Basic Programs</b> <b>Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)</b></p>
---

**A. Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools**

The assessment administered in 2001-2002 was the SAT 9 (Stanford Achievement Test) in grades 2, 4, 8, & 11. The state assessment delivered in SD in 2002-2003 was the Dakota STEP (State Test of Educational Progress) in grades 3-8 & 11. The results of the two tests cannot be compared. Therefore, question A1 & A2 are not applicable to SD.

1. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2001-2002 school year. \_\_\_\_NA\_\_\_\_

2. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2001-2002 school year. \_\_\_\_NA\_\_\_\_

**B. Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program**

For the 2002-2003 school year, please provide the following:

- |   |            |
|---|------------|
| 1. Total Number of Title I schools in the State                     | <u>347</u> |
| 2. Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State | <u>231</u> |
| 3. Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State  | <u>116</u> |

### C. Title I, Part A Student Participation

#### 1. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Special Services/Programs and Racial/Ethnic Groups

In the following tables, please provide the *unduplicated* number of children participating in Title I, Part A in the State by special services/programs and racial/ethnic groups. Count a child only once (*unduplicated* count) in each category even if the child participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State during the reporting period. Include students in both Title I schoolwide and targeted assistance programs.

Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs	
	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	5,408
Limited English Proficient	2,236
Homeless	340
Migrant	335

Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group	
	Number of Students Served
American Indian or Alaskan Native	9,799
Asian	176
Black or African American	503
Hispanic or Latino	616
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0
White	14,846

## 2. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

Title I, Part A student participation counts by grade and by public, private and local neglected should be reported as *unduplicated* counts. Please enter the number of participants by grade in Title I public targeted assistance programs (TAS), Title I schoolwide *programs* (SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs, and students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level						
	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total	Percent of Total
Age 0-2	0	0	0		0	0
Age 3-5	78	917	0		995	3.84
K	552	2,035	23		2610	10.06
1	1,235	1,993	30	1	3,259	12.56
2	986	1,876	29		2891	11.14
3	1,009	1,951	30	3	2,993	11.54
4	948	2,039	36	1	3024	11.66
5	717	2,139	33		2889	11.14
6	427	1,451	53	1	1932	7.45
7	308	1,258	99	2	1667	6.43
8	201	1,182	133		1516	5.84
9	75	504	195		774	2.98
10	48	354	205		607	2.34
11	35	282	113		430	1.66
12	37	256	60		353	1.36
Ungraded	0	0	0		0	0
<b>TOTALS</b>	6,656	18,237	1,039	8	25,940	100

### 3. Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, A in targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2002-2003 school year.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, A Targeted Assistance (TAS) Programs by Instructional and Support Services</b>	
<b>Instructional Services</b>	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	4018
Reading/Language Arts	5422
Science	0
Social Studies	0
Vocational/Career	0
Other (specify)	72*
<b>Support Services</b>	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	0
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	0
Other (specify)	0

\* Other uses Extended Day Kindergarten  
 -Preschool  
 -Spelling

### C. Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, A targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2002-2003 school year by job category. For administrators and supervisors who service both targeted assistance and schoolwide programs, report the FTE attributable to their TAS duties only.

<b>Staff Information for Title I, A Targeted Assistance Programs</b>	
	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	22.48
Teachers	352.42
Teacher Aides	137.585
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	44.83
Other (specify)	0

<b>II. William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs (Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)</b>
---

**A. Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

For the 2002-2003 school year, please provide the following information:

**1. Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State**

a. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State      5

**2. Even Start Families Served**

a. Total number of families served      227

b. Total number of adults participating      242

c. Total number of adults who are English language learners      69

d. Total number of children participating      348

**3. Characteristics of newly enrolled families at the time of enrollment**

a. Number of newly enrolled families      130

b. Number of newly enrolled adult participants      130

c. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the  
Federal Poverty level      119

d. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a  
high school diploma or GED      128-92%

e. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have  
not gone beyond the 9<sup>th</sup> grade      105-76%

**4. Percent of families that have remained in the program**

a. Less than 3 months      8%

b. From 4 to 6 months      22%

c. From 7 to 12 months      29%

d. More than 12 months      40%

## B. State Even Start Performance Indicators

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its performance indicators developed under section 1240 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Include all State indicators, as developed under section 1240, including both required and optional indicators. Provide any targets set, measures used and results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets or standards, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. For indicators with more than one year of available data, please note the data in the results column and include trend information in the assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

<b>Indicator</b> <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	<b>Target or Standards</b> <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
EXAMPLE: Adult achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving and numeracy	EXAMPLE: 75% of adult learners will make a grade-level gain over a program year	EXAMPLE: Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE)	EXAMPLE: 2001-2002: 45% of adult participants met target 2002-2003: 50% of adult participants met target	EXAMPLE: Target was not met in 2002-2003, but positive movement toward target was seen between 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.	EXAMPLE: Information on participation showed that only 50% of adult participants stayed in the program for 12 months. Participants who remained in the program for at least one full year were more likely to meet target. Of participants who remained in program for one full year, 70% met target as compared to only 40% of participants who remained in program for less than 12 months.
1240 (1)(A)  Achievement in the areas of reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving, and numeracy	<b>50%</b> of adult participants who have attended and after at least 40 hours of high intensity reading, writing, numeracy and problem solving activities offered and who pre tested 0-8.9 will advance at least one grade level as validated by a formal assessment tool.	TABE BEST	0	<b>0%</b> Target not met	Baseline

1240 (1)(A) Achievement in the areas of reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving, and numeracy	<b>50%</b> of adult participants who have attended and after at least 40 hours of high intensity reading, writing, numeracy and problem solving activities offered and who pre tested 9.0-10.9 will advance at least one grade level as validated by a formal assessment tool.	TABE BEST	0	<b>0%</b> Target not met	Baseline
1240 (1)(A) Achievement in the areas of reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving, and numeracy	<b>75%</b> of non-English speaking adult Even Start participants who have attended at least 40 hours of English language acquisition activities and who pre tested 0-50 will advance a minimum of 5 points toward proficiency in speaking and communicating in the English language as validated by a formal assessment tool.	BEST	0	<b>0%</b> Target not met	Baseline
1240 (1)(B) Receipt of a high school diploma or a general equivalency diploma (GED)	<b>43%</b> of adult Even Start participants who met the prerequisites to obtain a GED or are seeking a High School Diploma and have attended at least 12 hours of tutoring or training sessions offered, will pass the GED, or earn a High School Diploma as evidenced by documentation.	TABE TABE score under 8.9	18	<b>55%</b> Target met and exceeded	Baseline
	<b>50%</b> of high school students with a goal of earning a high school diploma and after attending one semester of formal instruction will earn a minimum of 1 credit (2 classes).	High School Credits	1	<b>13%</b> Target not met	Baseline

1240 (1)I  Entry into a post-secondary school job retraining program, or employment or career advancement, including the military.	<p>Upon completion of the adult education goals in the Even Start program</p> <p>a. <b>28%</b> adult learners with a goal of advanced education or training will enroll in post secondary or vocational education program.</p> <p><b>A. 34%</b> of adult learners not employed and in the workforce at enrollment will obtain employment.</p> <p><b>A. 42%</b> of adult learners who are employed upon enrollment shall retain or advance in employment.</p>	<p>Program Follow-up-Adult education Reporting System</p> <p>Contact log</p> <p>Employability Plan</p> <p>Personal development Plan</p>	<p>a. 4</p> <p>b. 20</p> <p>c. 1</p>	<p>a. <b>31%</b> Target met and exceeded</p> <p>b. <b>38%</b> Target met and exceeded</p> <p><b>A. 33%</b> Target not met</p>	Baseline
1240 (2)(a)  Improvement in ability to read on grade level or reading readiness:	<b>95%</b> of all children who attend Even Start for 6 months or more will demonstrate progress in developmentally appropriate emergent language and literacy areas as validated by a screening and assessment process annually or at exit.	Preschool Language Scale	.7	<b>4%</b> Target not met	2002-2003. Not all children assessed, still training staff or pending agreements with partners.
1240 (2)(B)  School Attendance	<b>All</b> children who attend Even Start for six months or more will meet or exceed the average daily attendance rate of the child's program or school.	Daily attendance records	14	<b>7%</b> Target not met	Baseline All data not entered.



1240 (2)I Grade Retention & Promotion (K-3)	<b>95%</b> of school-age (age 5-8) children, who participate in Even Start for six months or more, will demonstrate progress in the ability to read on grade level, in accordance with state content standards, as validated by the school administered assessments.	Local assessments	2	<b>5%</b> Target not met	Baseline All data not entered.
1240 (2)I Grade Retention & Promotion (K-3)	All children in K- grade 3, who participate in Even Start for six months or more, will meet the criteria for promotion for that grade level as established by the local school system.	Promotion	1	<b>20%</b>	Baseline
1240 (1)(D)(I) Interactive Literacy.	All parents/guardians who participate in Even Start for 6 months or more will support their children's literacy development by being actively involved in home, school and community life, as evidenced by documenting at least three home, school, or community literacy-related activities during the program year.	HOME  Parent Education Assessments (PIPE, PAT)  Parenting Education Profile (when available)	64	<b>54%</b> Target not met	All data not entered.
1240 (1)(D)(II) Collaboration	All of the South Dakota Even Start programs will collaborate with existing agencies/programs that serve adults and/or children for the benefit of participants as evidenced b signed agreements on file.	Interagency agreements signed and on file.  Minutes of meetings, monthly reports.	5	<b>100%</b> Target met	Programs required to collaborate and develop written agreements as part of the application and start-up processes.

### C. Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

**\*\* SD does not use the GPRA indicators and will not complete this section**

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting the federal performance indicators listed for Even Start participants in your State.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> <i>Number of participants who have this goal</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
A. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading						
B. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of mathematics						
C. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English language acquisition						
D. Percentage of school age adults who earn						

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> <i>Number of participants who have this goal</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
a high school diploma or GED						
E. Percentage of non- school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED						
F. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development						
G. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of reading readiness						
H. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on						

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> <i>Number of participants who have this goal</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Number and Percentage of participants who met this goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
grade level						
I. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities						

<b>III. Education of Migratory Children (Title I, Part C)</b>
---

Please complete the following charts for the Title I, Part C program.

**General Data Reporting Information**

1. The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) for reporting year 2002-2003. The Reporting Period for these data is September 1, 2002, to August 31, 2003.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

## INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE I. POPULATION DATA

In Table I States are to report the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). Include children who changed ages (e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age) or grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. For example, a child who turns three during the reporting year would only be counted in the Ages 3 – 5 cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

<b>TABLE I. POPULATION DATA</b>	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>A. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN</b>																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	17	206	179	211	224	215	223	206	204	177	166	155	156	125	69	64	—	1845
<b>B. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES</b>																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"	17	30	40	36	29	23	28	27	20	18	11	13	16	9	3	14	—	334
<b>C. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)</b>																		
1. Migrant Children who are LEP	X	0	37	34	28	29	24	20	21	14	17	24	23	10	1	0	0	282
<b>D. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>																		
1. Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	X	8	15	18	22	21	33	20	24	21	18	8	14	10	6	0	0	238
<b>E. MOBILITY</b>																		
1. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	20	44	61	57	57	45	45	40	34	31	28	27	22	11	4	16	—	542
2. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 – 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	40	105	82	90	88	82	85	85	74	62	49	59	49	44	15	27	—	1036

TABLE I. POPULATION DATA		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
3.	Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 – 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	70	172	137	159	177	174	159	149	140	131	119	116	102	87	58	39	—	1989
4.	Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months)	60	143	109	113	113	114	100	91	80	71	61	59	40	32	14	33	—	1236

## INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS

Table II asks for the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Include children who changed grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>F. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION</b> – (Note: Data on the high school graduation <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> for migrant students has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																		
1. Dropped out of school												2	1	3	1			7
2. Obtained GED																		0
<b>ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT</b> -- (Note: The results of migrant students on State assessments in mathematics and reading/ language arts have been collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																		



### INSTRUCTION: TABLE III. G. MEP PARTICIPATION – REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR

Table III G. asks for the statewide, *unduplicated* number of children who were served by the MEP in the regular school year by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Participation information is required for children who *received instructional or support services* funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. *DO NOT count migrant children served through any schoolwide programs (SWP), even if they combined MEP funds, in any row of this table.*

Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2002-2003 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

*Count only those children who were actually served; do not count children not served. Include in this table all children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.*

Served in a Regular School Year Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a “referred” service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service. Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the specific MEP instructional service noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received any type of referred service (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child). This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP personnel.

TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>G. PARTICIPATION—REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR</b>																			
1. Served in MEP (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only – do not include children served in any SWPs even if MEP funds are combined)		36	44	102	88	99	82	76	71	57	59	46	44	44	23	14	—	—	885
2. Priority for Service		Not Collected																	
3. Continuation of Service		Not Collected																	
4. Any Instructional Service																			1543*
5. Reading Instruction																			534*
6. Mathematics Instruction																			500*
7. High School Credit Accrual																	—	—	—
8. Any Support Service																			462*
9. Counseling Service																			0*
10. Any Referred Service																			249*

A. Not collected by grade

### INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE III. H. MEP PARTICIPATION –SUMMER/INTERSESSION TERM

Table III H. asks for the statewide unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in a summer or intersession term by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Participation information is required for children who *received instructional or support services* funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.

Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age in only in the higher age cell. Count summer/intersession students in the appropriate grade based on the promotion date definition used in your state. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

*Count only those children who were actually served; do not count children not served. Include in this table all children who received a MEP funded service, even children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.*

Served in a Summer or Intersession Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a “referred” service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service. Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the specific MEP instructional service noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received any type of referred service (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child). This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP personnel.

<b>TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION</b>		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>H. PARTICIPATION—SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION</b>																			
1. Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)		20	25	37	27	24	27	18	16	13	8	3	4	5	0	0	0	0	227
2. Priority for Service		Not Collected																	
3. Continuation of Service		Not Collected																	
4. Any Instructional Service																			339*
5. Reading Instruction																			113*
6. Mathematics Instruction																			100*
7. High School Credit Accrual													0	0	0	0	0	0	0*
8. Any Support Service																			141*
9. Counseling Service																			0*
10. Any Referred Service																			12*

A. Not collected by grade

### INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA

Table IV asks for information on the number of schools and number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools and who received the special services noted below according to the descriptive categories.

In the first column of Table IV, enter the number of schools that enroll *eligible* migrant children. In the second column, enter the number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools. In the second column, since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child, the count of eligible children enrolled will be duplicated statewide.

TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA		
I. STUDENT ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a. 389	b. 1,845
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 0	b. 0

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. J. MEP PROJECT DATA – TYPE OF MEP PROJECT**

Enter the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. DO NOT include *schoolwide* programs that were supported with MEP funds in any row of this table.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA		
J. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT	NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Services Provided During the School Day Only)	a. 19	b. 885
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a. 0	b. 0
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a. 0	b. 0
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a. 9	b. 227

# INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. K. MEP PROJECT DATA – KEY MEP PERSONNEL

For each school term, enter the number of *full-time-equivalent* staff whose salaries are paid by the MEP. Report FTE units by job classification. Define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each term in your state. For example, one regular term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days, one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days, and one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.

DO NOT include staff employed in *schoolwide* programs that combined MEP funds/services with those of other programs.

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA		
K. KEY MEP PERSONNEL	REGULAR-TERM FTE 1 FTE = <u>180</u> Days	SUMMER-TERM /INTERSESSION FTE 1 FTE = <u>20</u> Days
1. State Director	a. 0.40*	b. 0.05*
2. Teachers	a. 23.33	b. 17.62
3. Counselors	a. 1	b. 0
4. All Paraprofessionals	a. 13.20	b. 15.60
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	a. 11.80	b. 13.60
6. Recruiters	a. 0.72	b. 0.02
7. Records Transfer Staff	a. 0	b. 0

A. 1 FTE for a State Director (State employee) is equal to a 240 day year

**IV. Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth  
Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)**

The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2003-2004 school year. These data will not be available in Spring 2004, but will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report which will cover the results of school year 2003-2004 activities.



**V. Comprehensive School Reform  
(Title I, Part F)**

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

## **VI. Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) (Title II, Part A)**

In the September 2003 Consolidated State Application submission and Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report, States provided the following teacher quality information from the 2002-2003 school year: (1) the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high and low-poverty schools in the State; (2) the percentage of teachers who received “high-quality professional development;” and (3) the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

<b>VII. Enhancing Education through Technology (Title II, Part D)</b>
---

The first school year in which LEA projects were implemented is the 2003-2004 school year. Therefore performance data for this program will not be available until next year when the next Consolidated State Performance Report will be due.

## **VIII. English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement (Title III, Part A)**

States are not required to report any additional data for the 2002-2003 school year in this Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report. States reported data for the 2002-2003 school year for the Title III program in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application. Specifically, in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application, States reported the information listed below.

- A. A description of the status of the State's efforts to establish English language proficiency (ELP) standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describing how the State's ELP standards:

- Address grades K through 12
- Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing
- Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006).

2. English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. ELP baseline data included all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

- A. The ELP baseline data included the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);
- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and
- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

- B. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.
- If a State was reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:
  - Describe how the composite score was derived;
  - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
  - Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

**3.** Information on the total number of students assessed for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

**4.** Information on the total number of students identified as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

A. Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. In September 2003, States provided performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English
- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency

Through the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year and future years and through the Biennial Performance Report for Title III, States will be required to report information similar to that reported for the September 2003 Consolidated State Application.

## **IX. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (Title IV, Part A)**

### **General Instructions**

Words that appear underlined throughout (for example, "physical fighting") should be defined in accordance with State policy or based on the instrument the State uses to collect the information. States are asked to submit their definition of these terms.

If your State does not collect data in the same format requested on this form, the State may provide data from a similar question. If that occurs, please include a footnote for those data that explains the differences between the data requested on the form and the data the State is able to supply.

- A. In the following chart, please identify each of your State indicators as submitted by the State in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application and provide the following:
  - a. the instrument or data source used to measure the indicator
  - b. the frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection
  - c. 2002-2003 baseline data
  - d. targets for the years in which your State has established targets

**A. 1 State Performance Indicators for Title IV, A – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities**

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection and year of most recent collection	2002-2003 Baseline	Targets
1. PRC's assist schools with the acquisition, implementation and evaluation of SBR materials	PRC logs	Annually	Not avail.	2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
2. PRC's train and support schools in developing ATOD policies, programming and curricula.	PRC logs	Annually	Not avail.	2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
3. Community Mobilization initiative will establish a network of CMPs throughout SD and help each council identify goals.	Community Networker log	Annually	Not avail.	2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
4. CPN communities will demonstrate a measurable decrease in the indicator of alcohol and other drug abuse in target communities of 2% by 2004.	Social Indicator data	Annually	Not avail.	2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
5. Utilizing the Diversion Prevention Program, the Division will work to divert youth into the appropriate level of programming and maintain an 80% successful completion rate.	Diversion logs	Annually	Just began gathering	2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
6. There will be less than 9% of participants receiving Primary Prevention Programming or Intensive Prevention Programming referred for structured treatment services.	Diversion logs	Annually	Not avail.	2003-2004
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007
				2004-2005
				2005-2006
				2006-2007

**A.2 Provide an explanation of the data provided in the table (A.1).**

Data not available.

**B.** In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students. States should use their definition of elementary, middle, and high school and provide those definitions in the report.

**A. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for physical fighting.**

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	197	19
Middle	336	34
High School	353	43

**A. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possession**

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	50	17
Middle	49	14
High School	43	16

**A. The number of alcohol-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.**

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	2	1
Middle	26	10
High School	170	28

**A. The number of illicit drug-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.**

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	7	3
Middle	45	12
High School	151	21



**C. Describe the outcomes of the State's efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts.**

The Prevention Resource Center network across the state provides a wide range of information to parents through the use of newspaper articles; inserting information in the school newsletters; and providing pamphlets on parenting and substance use issues at events such as parent teacher conferences and health fairs. They offer parent education through the use of Family Fun Nights where parents and their students attend an hour where we utilize activities that teach a certain message that we are trying to get across. They also offer Walking the Talk parent curriculum and Common Sense Parenting classes.

Regionally, covering the state, there are 12 Community Mobilization Projects, staffed with Prevention Specialists. These preventionists work closely with schools and communities in their region to include parents in every opportunity to address issues of concern for their area related to ATOD/violence matters.

**X. 21st Century Community Learning Centers  
(Title IV, Part B)**

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

## **XI. Innovative Programs (Title V, Part A)**

**A.** Please describe **major** results to date of State-level Title V, Part A funded activities to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students. Please use quantitative data if available (e.g., increases in the number of highly qualified teachers).

- Two primary professional development activities were funded with State-level Title V Part A funds. Training for teachers in 6+1 writing traits was provided across the state.
- Title V Part A funds were also used to support the Governor's Teacher Leadership Conference in September 2003. Over 500 SD teacher leaders attended the conference that focused professional development and technical assistance on NCLB (No Child Left Behind) topics including standards, assessment, accountability, school improvement, and highly qualified teacher requirements. The objective at the conference was to raise awareness and understanding of the NCLB act in order to support implementation and raise student achievement.

**B.** The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20%** or more of Title V, Part A funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including: (1)** student achievement in reading and math, **(2)** teacher quality, **(3)** safe and drug free schools, **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2002-2003 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

Priority Activity/Area <sup>1</sup>	Number of LEAs that used <b>20%</b> or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A (see Note) for:	Number of these LEAs that met AYP	Total Number of Students Served
Area 1: <b>Student Achievement in Reading and Math</b>	29	1	117,366
Area 2: <b>Teacher Quality</b>	7	1	4,796
Area 3: <b>Safe and Drug Free Schools</b>	1	0	70
Area 4: <b>Increase Access for all Students</b>	12	1	5,101
Note: Funds from REAP and Local Flex (Section 6152) that are used for Title V, Part A purposes and funds transferred into Title V, Part A under the transferability option under section 6132(b).			

**B.1** Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2002-2003, 20% or more of Title V, Part A funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above.   0  

**B.2** Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2002-2003.   0  

<sup>1</sup> In completing this table, States should include activities described in Section 5131 of the ESEA as follows: Area 1 (activities 3, 9,12,16,19,20,22,26,27), Area 2 (activity 1,2), Area 3 (activity 14,25), Area 4 (activities 4,5,7,8,15,17)

## XII. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) (Title VI, Part B)

### A. Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2002-2003 school year.

133

### B. Rural and Low-Income School Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2)

1. LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2002-2003 school year.

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	1
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	3
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	2
Parental involvement activities	1
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	0
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	3
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	1

2. Describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools Programs as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

In developing the LEA Consolidated Application, districts must describe the comprehensive needs assessment it conducted to identify strengths, weaknesses, and priority needs. Goals and objectives are then determined to address those needs. Strategies are identified and funds allocated to support those strategies. This process enables districts to channel funds to address the identified needs, aligned with the 5 ESEA goals.

The DOE has adopted these 5 ESEA goals as its own. Baseline data was generated during the 2002-2003 school year. Progress will be measured once 2003-2004 data is available.

### XIII. Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)

#### A. State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of section 6123(a) during the 2002-2003 school year? No

#### B. Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds

1. Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of section 6123(b) during the 2002-2003 school year. 14
2. In the charts below, please indicate below the total number of LEAs that transferred funds TO and FROM each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred TO and FROM each eligible program.

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>TO</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>TO</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	2	11,931
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	1	1,857
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	8	127,939
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	5	32,588

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>FROM</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>FROM</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	10	146,244
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	3	8,181
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	4	15,847
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	2	4,043

*The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.*